

tion), as I had with Mr. A. Kent, Mr. Hunter said also, send Dr. P. Mr. Kent and use "a copy of these charges" (w/it's the idea that remedies would be applied).

I, on the 7th of Feb. sent the first list of charges to these remarks gentlemen. On the same day I wrote to the Mayor, and said, "it came to my notice yesterday that some of the gentlemen of the Board have become aware that drastic reform is needed in nearly all, and every respect, and that they are about to glean out THEIR OWN stable themselves. Hence, these remarks UNMISTAKABLY, THE NEED of that cleaning, and that THEY are the persons to do this" In the same letter, I said to the Mayor, "Under these circumstances, please, hold my charges in abeyance, and take no further steps until you hear from me," and that "it is undesirable to bring the matter before "the public," as it might cause a "falling off" in the subscription. (See "SPECIAL NOTICE" further on).

Neither Mr. Kent, nor Hunter acknowledged the receipt of my letter or of my charges, Dr. P., however did so on the 12th of Feb., and took the opportunity to say "these remarks seemed to him UNWORTHY OF A CHRISTIAN GENTLEMAN," enclosing his letter WITH THESE WORDS: "Trusting that this investigation is being conducted MORE CAREFULLY in discharging the duties of our trust." So much for these three gentlemen, at the present.

I wish here to draw special notice to the attitude of the Mayor towards the patients by reason of my actions, and by reason of the attitude of his own Inspector (Mr. Walsh) His Worship's attitude was most decidedly and unquestionably ON MY side, and on the side of THE PATIENTS, and I CHALLENGE HIM TO DENY IT!! I will deal with the Mayor later on.

MY CHARGES (IN FACT).
The next thing is my publication in "The News," of the 13th of Feb., as follows:

A deputation from the H. for I., headed by Mr. A. Kent, and Mr. T. Chamberlain this morning, in reference to charges made against the management of the institution by a man named Elliott. He stated that poor food was supplied the inmates, and that the nurses were negligent. The deputation showed that the charges were quite without foundation. There are at present 182 inmates in the institution, and more than half of them are bed-ridden. The revenue for the past year has been insufficient to pay running expenses, and the Board has had to draw on capital account.

"THE NEWS" ON 15TH FEB.
In reply to this, I challenged them to meet me on a public platform, as follows:

"The deputation showed that the charges were quite without foundation." If the deputation really told Dr. Cha. or anyone else that my charges were "quite without foundation"—or even that they were in "agreement" with the deputation—then they told an untruth. Would to God—and for the sake of suffering, helpless humanity at the H. for I.—that these "infectious" deputationists and the Board would meet me on a public platform. I dare them to do it! Their manliness (?) prompts them to do backdoor work. Let a little honest manliness prevail, and I am ready to have it out with them in public. Then we will see who is telling the truth.

This challenge was not accepted. This challenge and its non-acceptance, went the rounds of the newspapers, and the "Globe," 21st Feb., published a letter from A. V. Mackenzie, all my charges, and now, patient and gentle reader, read the following letter from Dr. Cha., and tell me if you really think my charges are lies. (Toronto, Feb. 17, '08.)

To Col. R. H. for I.:

Dear Sir,—I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of 14th inst. in reference to certain charges made against the H. for I. Before receiving your letter, and some days before knowing anything of your complaints MADE TO ME FROM ANOTHER QUARTER and I took steps to

bring the matter before the Board. A deputation, of the Board THIS-EVENING waited on me and were into explanations as to the ACTION THAT WAS ABOUT TO BE TAKEN BY THE BOARD. I trust, therefore, that whatever may have been the DEFECTS EXISTING IN THE PAST they will be REMEDIATED AT AN EARLY DAY.

Yours truly,

T. F. Chamberlain, Inspector.

THE MAYOR AND THE TURNING POINT, ETC.

When the Mayor got my letter of 7th of Feb., stopping His Worship's former action, he replied on 9th of Feb: "On of the ladies of the Executive Committee, called me up by phone on Saturday," etc. etc. "SHE ALSO STATED THAT PROCEEDINGS WERE BEING TAKEN TO REMEDY THE DEFECTS IN THE MANAGEMENT, WHICH WERE COMPLAINED OF." The Mayor went on to say that "but I fear it may be necessary for me to present them my charges, etc. etc." to the Board of Control, when the "estimates are under consideration." (I here incidentally mention that, by the newspaper report, His Worship did NOT do this).

THE TURNING POINT.

In "P. 8," in the Mayor's own handwriting, in about the 10th of Feb. letter, he says: "HENCE WRITING ABOVE MR. MORTIMER CLARK HAS ARRANGED FOR AN INTERVIEW WITH TEO-MORROW." I presented on Feb. 10th in vain, against this interview, without my presence!

I understand that Dr. P. was with Mr. M. C. at the interview, FROM THIS MOMENT THE WHOLE ATTITUDE OF THE MAYOR CHANGED. On 10th Feb. I wrote another letter, withdrawing my "holding-a-lobby" request of 7th Feb. Now note His Worship's reply to this, on 10th of Feb!! "I shall now consider myself at liberty to make whatever use of your letters as may appear best IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST."

TRANSFORMATION SCENE IN THREE "PAGES"

1. The Mayor's "aid," on 8rd Feb. is going to expose the matter to the Board of Control, 9th of Feb.
2. Mr. M. C., and Dr. P. appear on the scene!!

3. And the Mayor is going to act for THIS PUBLIC INTEREST after these influential persons interview him!! All the subsequent acts of the Mayor (for the "Public Interest" remember!), are, I will show, for the "interest" of the Board—a Board, which I will also show, is governed, ruled, controlled, etc. etc., by about six out of nine women, who alone from the Ex. Com.—YE MEN of Fortune think of THE MEN, who know what it is to be GOVERNED by a WOMAN!! will you have the courage to INVESTIGATE THIS specially? This woman committee who have caused dozens of presidents, members, matrons and others to leave the Board, and the Home in disgust (and many who refuse to work with them, and many who refuse to JOIN the Board, when solicited. One President left because he could NOT PUT UP WITH THOSE WOMEN, and all the patients simmer and stew in treatment of the most inhuman kind—"WOMEN" not I disagree— I deal with them later on. To the Mayor's spite!

THE MAYOR'S "RIGHT ABOUT FACE," THE INVESTIGATION, ETC.

On 2nd of March I met the Mayor outside the Board room door before the wonderful "INVESTIGATION." The few words which passed between us I at once saw how that "Investigation" was going to be carried on and ended. Sir, I ever mean to get over my part, and clear out quickly. This will explain to many well wishers why I left the room! The Invest. DID go on and DID end, exactly as I anticipated. The Mayor was "thoroughly satisfied" with his "thorough Invest." "Quite satisfied" that my charges and those of his own Inspector, and others, were "quite unproved." Now how was the "invest." conducted? Were any "evidence" called on either side? Any "evidence" means that which elucidates and enables the mind to see truth—"a witness"—"one who testifies to a fact," etc. etc.

The Mayor, Dr. Cha., and Dr. Sheard left the room for a short time to "Invest." They go to the patients and tell them not to fear—they may freely and fearlessly appeal to THEM!! They go to Ward No. —, and ask, "Have you anything to say about the Hospital complaint?" The patient promptly replies, "I'm not going to tell you anything at all." Why not? "Because, I have been told that shall tell the rest of the Home if I do!" is the reply. "Oh, no, you won't, we will protect you."

Now the great majority of these patients are exceedingly intelligent, and they know that when the PROTECTORATE of the Mayor ceased at the end of the meeting (7 p. m.) they would be under the PROTECTION OF THE BOARD! THE WOMEN, Ex-Com. of the Board, Head Nurse and House Doctor, of whom they stand in great terror and whom they nearly all cordially hate.

No witnesses were called, one way or the other, or anywhere ON, yes, by the bye, there was ONE witness in favor of the patients, and that was a circular sent to the patients on this GREAT DAY OF INVEST, that two of their number had been dismissed and that the others were warned to "behave themselves" as a LIKE LIKE I saw and then (or words to that effect). The Mayor said that such a circular was a "most disgraceful and intimidating" procedure, "and that it was a disgrace to a witness for the patients." A question was asked, "Were the two patients who were dismissed allowed any hearing in their defence?"

What does the Mayor know REALLY and by PERSONAL experience? Has he visited the patients six years, six months, six weeks, six days, six hours? No! He visited them in array and intimidation for three quarters of an hour. He rendered his own Inspector's report (BY HIS WORDS RESPECTING IT) mere WASTE OF TIME, and so my charges would have shared "a like fate." I saw this and got away quickly, hoping for a more favorable opportunity.

The Mayor's action amounted to condemnation of all the charges AS MERELY HEARSAY EVIDENCE. Now, I want to ask the Mayor, "What is HIS "evidence" Certainly not from visiting for six years. Certainly not from REAL, CONSTANT, PERSONAL CONTACT WITH THE PATIENTS IN VISITING IN sorrow, and in sympathy! Then where DID he get it from? Why was HEARSAY EVIDENCE given by THOSE WHOSE INTEREST IN THE MATTER TO SHIELD THEMSELVES FROM THE RESULT OF THEIR OWN GROSS MIS-MANAGEMENT, ROBBERY, JOHNNERY, etc., etc., and the Mayor believe THEM, and did not believe the patients? I ask, "Is the value of the hearsay evidence (WITH PROOF), of the PATIENTS of less value than the hearsay evidence of their oppressors?" who only have the proof of power and influence, and whose one, and only one thought it is to "scare" for themselves. I ask, "NO" more patients, and would a Magistrate on the Bench do this in case? Ask Colonel Denton!

But the Mayor is satisfied "Quite satisfied" in his interview with Mr. M. C., and Dr. P.—not quite satisfied BEFORE that interview, thought!

If were a Mr. M. C. or a Rev. Dostoy, etc., etc., and the Mayor believe them, so slyly and of course I infer, I think I would have fared better.

THE OPINION OF OTHERS AS TO THE VERDICT OF THE INVESTIGATION.

The Rev. W. Brookman writes in the "Mail and Empire" on 8rd of March: "Sir—in the matter of the invest yesterday at the H. for I., as one who has long taken some little interest in that institution, my congregation having gone there for the last twenty years with a thank-offering of fruit and flowers in token sympathy with its sick and convalescents; I think it is only right and in accordance with British fair play to the public of Toronto, to say: (1) That it was not a public hearing, but a trial, called by advertisement, but one by invitation or request of the friends connected with the institution or its boards, and conducted by the friends and physicians who had been at various times connected with the home, so that I, for